

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants note, with appreciation, the identification of claims 19-22 as allowable if rewritten to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As suggested, claim 19 has been rewritten as new independent claim 23.

With regard to the rejection of claims 12-13 and 18-22 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicants regard as the invention, applicants have amended claim 12 to provide all features therein with an antecedent basis. Further, claim 20 has been amended to depend from claim 19 instead of claim 12 as suggested in the Office action.

With regard to the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,745,202 to Yamauchi et al., applicants respectfully submit that Yamauchi et al. fails to teach every feature of the present invention. Yamauchi et al. fails to teach “a light shielding film extending from a displaying side of said liquid crystal panel to a displaying side of said film carrier”, as claimed in amended claim 12. As described in the specification and shown in Figure 7(A) of Yamauchi et al., a “light interceptive member 180 made of sponge, rubber, or the like is interposed between the glass substrate and a frame 210.” Col. 6, ln. 60-62. Arranged in this manner, the light interceptive member of Yamauchi et al. extends from a reverse side of the liquid crystal panel to a displaying side of the frame. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 12, as amended, is not anticipated by Yamauchi et al.

Analogous to amended claim 12, newly added claim 25 includes “a light shielding film extending from a reverse side of said liquid crystal panel to a reverse side of said film carrier”. Again, Yamauchi et

Appl. No. 09/876,494
Amdt. Dated: October 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2003

al. teaches only a light interceptive member disposed between the glass substrate of the liquid crystal panel and the frame. Arranged in this manner the light shielding member extends from a reverse side of the liquid crystal panel to a displaying side of the frame. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is allowable.

Newly added claim 26 specifies that one end of said liquid crystal panel is located on the film carrier and another end of said liquid crystal panel is projected away from the film carrier. According to Yamauchi et al., each end of the liquid crystal panel is supported on the frame. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is allowable.

Any remaining claims are allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 30821US3.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By 
Aaron A. Fishman

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: October 17, 2003